

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.183(a) as allegedly failing to show “the connector for coupling to a flat panel display”; “a flat panel display controller”; “internal timer”; “a clock counter” and “a flat panel display being coupled/decoupled to/from the connector”. Applicant is somewhat confused by the assertion of the rejection and respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection since Applicant had submitted a new Fig. 2 in response to the previous office action which noted that the connector is labeled 112. As such “the connector for coupling to a flat panel display” was clearly shown in Fig. 2. The Applicant is also confused as to why “a flat panel display controller” is to be required in the drawings as Applicant had amended, for example, claim 1 and others to correct the typographical error, as such a flat panel display engine is shown, for example, in Fig. 1 and elsewhere. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

As to the terms “internal timer” and “a clock counter”, Applicant has deleted claims 7-9 without prejudice at this time but reserves the right to add information in the Figures if required at a later date.

As to the term “a flat panel display being coupled/decoupled to/from the connector,” these terms apparently are those used in claims 11 and 12, for example, wherein the claim as a whole is a method claim indicating wherein a first state is indicative of a flat panel display being coupled to the connector. Again, Applicant is unsure as to the reason for the objection since Fig. 3 specifically shows in a state diagram the connection and unconnection detection of a flat panel display and in particular, the state indicating a flat panel being coupled to the connector or being

decoupled from the connector. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

The specification stands objected to for allegedly failing to provide support for the preamble and in particular, the words “detecting a monitor”. Again, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration since the specification in numerous places describes a method and apparatus for detecting a flat panel display. For example, the Field of the Invention indicates that the invention is directed to a method of detecting a flat panel display and subsequently enabling or disabling drivers associated with the monitor. Moreover, page 3 in the Detailed Description describes monitoring a detect pin wherein monitoring the detect pin determines that an external LCD or flat panel display has been connected. As such, a method for detecting a monitor is described throughout the specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn. In addition, the office action indicates that there is no support for monitoring a first node of a connector. Applicant respectfully submits that the word “node” is interchangeable with the word “pin” or any other suitable structure. Applicant nonetheless has amended claim 1. As to the term “the connector for coupling a flat panel display,” as noted this is connector 112 as previously submitted and set forth in the specification and also shown in Fig. 2 submitted in the last office action.

As to lines 4 and 5 of claim 1, the office action again states that “at a flat panel display controller” has been objected to. However, this language no longer appears in the claim as it was removed from the claim in the last response.

In claim 6, Applicant respectfully points the Examiner to page 6, lines 14-17, and other sections indicating that if the monitor detect pin remains asserted for a specified amount of time,

the detect module transitions from one state to another. As such, there is ample support in the specification for this term. Applicant has addressed the other objections above.

In the “Response to Arguments” section, the Examiner indicates that Applicant’s previous arguments were not persuasive and that the Examiner did not give weight to the preamble “detecting a monitor” language. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the argument was not based on merely the preamble, but the claim as a whole and the language in the body of the claim. For example, claim 1 requires among other things, monitoring a first node of a connector, the connector for coupling to a flat panel display and receiving the first output signal at a flat panel display engine. As Applicant has attempted to point out, the office action has indicated that the Verdun reference anticipates Applicant’s claimed invention through connector 42 and 45 and step 230 in Verdun. However, the office action does not appear to address Applicant’s remarks wherein Applicant noted that the connector 42 in Verdun is not monitored. In fact, it is not a connector that is a connector for coupling to a flat panel display since Verdun does not monitor a first node of a connector wherein the connector is for coupling to a flat panel display. In any event, Applicant has amended the claim to more clearly indicate what was inherent in the claim as originally filed, namely that the monitoring of a first pin is a pin of a connector coupled to a flat panel display. Since the office action appears to admit that the Verdun reference fails to teach or suggest monitoring a first pin of a connector connected to a flat panel display, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance.


Claims 4, 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Verdun. As to claim 4, Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made in the previous office action and note that the “Response to Arguments” section, the Patent Office does not appear to have addressed Applicant’s previous arguments. In particular, Applicant again

notes that the Verdun reference does not monitor a flat panel display connector as claimed and also fails to disclose a register based approach for storing an output signal indicative of whether the flat panel display connector is coupled to a flat panel display. As such, the claim is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 25, 2004

By: 
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7500
FAX: (312) 609-5005